





APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,715	01/14/2002	Yoshinobu Kiso	46/225	8223
20736	7590 11/04/2003		EXAMINER	
MANELLI DENISON & SELTER 2000 M STREET NW SUITE 700			WANG, SHENGJUN	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3307			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	6
			DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003	/

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/030,715	KISO ET AL.				
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Shengjun Wang	1617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</li> <li>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension</li> </ul>						
ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>14 October 2003</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s): Rejections under 35 U.S.	C. 112, first paragraph.				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly						
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	<b></b>	_				
7. Solution For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.				
9. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·				
0. Other:						
		Shegnio				

3

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the prior office action. Particularly, the envisioned difference in mechanism does not carry patentable weight insofar as the ultimate utility is obvious. As to the alleged synergestic and unexpected result, a few notable principles are well settled. It is applicant's burden to explain any proffered data and establish how any results therein should be taken to be unexpected and significant. See MPEP 716.02 (b). The claims must be commensurate in the scope with any evidence of unexpected results. See MPEP 716.02 (d). In the instant case, from the single point data herein, one of ordinary skill in the art could not tell if the result is just an additive, or a synergestic effect..

The proposed amendments would overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, simplify the issue for appeal.